

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-4, 12, 14, 16 and 18 have been amended, and claims 22-24 have been added. Thus, claims 1-24 are now active in the application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and revised to correct grammatical and idiomatic errors in order to aid the Examiner in further consideration of the application. The amendments to the specification and abstract are incorporated in the attached substitute specification and abstract. No new matter has been added.

In item 1 on page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner required a new title more clearly indicative of the claimed invention. Accordingly, the title has been amended to read --PALM-SIZED MOBILE INFORMATION TERMINAL WITH FINGER-INSERTION HOOKING PORTION--.

In item 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the term "said button portion" lacked proper antecedent basis. Accordingly, claim 12 has been amended to depend from claim 11 which provides the necessary antecedent basis for the term "said button portion".

In items 3-12 on pages 3-11 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. 2003/0025611) in view of Yang (U.S. 6,297,808); claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and Rosebrugh (U.S. 5,630,168); claims 3 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and further in view of Nakao (U.S. 6,352,322); claims 4, 17 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and further in view of Gettemy (U.S. 2004/0046739); claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and further in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. 2004/0203501); claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and further in view of Pahlavan (U.S. 2003/0142065); claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and further in view of Foote (U.S. 6,164,853); claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and further in view of Atsuhiro (JP 11-274747); claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and further in view of Perona (U.S. 5,181,009); and claim 20 was

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Yang and further in view of Ball et al. (U.S. 5,610,386).

These rejections are respectfully traversed and believed clearly inapplicable to the claims as now presented, for the following reasons.

With exemplary reference to the drawing figures, claim 1 sets forth a mobile information terminal comprising: a case 2 that is approximately palm-sized (see Figs. 1-3, 5(a) and 5(b)); a display device 1 having a screen, the display device 1 being stored in the case 2 such that the screen is exposed to outside the case 2; an electronic circuit 9 operable to control the display device 1; and a hooking portion 7 that is provided in an outward-protruding portion of the case 2, wherein the electronic circuit 9 is stored in the case 2, and wherein the hooking portion 7 is formed such that a finger (e.g. 11) can be inserted into an inside of the hooking portion 7.

Thus, with the arrangement of the present invention as recited in claim 1, the present inventive mobile information terminal of claim 1 is configured so that the user can insert his/her finger (or fingers) into the hooking portion 7 which is an outward-protruding portion of the case 2 while holding the information terminal in the palm of the hand as shown, for example, in Figs. 2, 3, 5(a) and 5(b). With this arrangement for holding the information terminal, the information terminal can be grasped reliably by the user and, at the same time, manipulated for functional use.

In contrast to the present invention of claim 1, and as apparently recognized by the Examiner, the Lin patent discloses a vehicle remote device which, although providing a key ring 26, 126 at its top end, does not include a hooking portion that is provided in an outward-protruding portion of the case, and is thus not configured for holding in the palm of the hand with the finger or fingers inserted through the hooking portion. This is clearly illustrated in Fig. 3 wherein the user merely grasps the device with the fingers on opposing surfaces thereof.

The key ring 26, 126 is just that, a key ring, and is thus disposed on a swivel connection so as to dangle properly as a key ring connection.

The Examiner cited the Yang patent for disclosing a "finger hole for conveniently holding a device in hand." However, the Yang device is configured to be worn as a ring-type device and not to be held in the palm of a hand with a finger or fingers to be inserted through the finger holes. Thus, with the arrangement of the Yang device, a user inserts his/her finger or fingers through the finger hole(s), without the device being holdable in the palm of the hand.

Accordingly, it is believed apparent that a person having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the palm-graspable device of Lin having the key ring 26, 126 thereon for key-ring connection, by utilizing the integrated finger-hole(s) 11 of Yang which is adapted to cause the Yang controller device to be worn like a ring. That is, the Yang finger-hole design is such as to teach the ordinary artisan to integrate a finger hole or holes into the body of the device itself so that the device can be worn as a ring and not to protrude a portion of a case outwardly from the case to be used for insertion of a finger or fingers while the remainder of the device is held in the palm of a hand.

Further, the key ring 26, 126 of the Lin device is provided with a swivel connection as is customary with a key-ring type device to allow for proper dangling of the device from the key ring. The Yang arrangement is just the opposite, arranged with the finger-holes integral with the device such that the device can be worn on the finger or fingers as a ring-type device. It would not be desirable to modify the Lin device by making the key-ring 26, 126 as an outward-protruding portion of the case, because then the Lin key ring would not have the desired swivel portion advantageously provided for properly dangling from a key ring arrangement.

The Examiner cited the Rosebrugh, Nakao, Gettemy, Johnson et al, Pahlavan, Foote, Atsuhiro, Perona and Ball et al. references for teaching various specific features of the present dependent claims. However, these references provide no teaching or suggestion that would have obviated the above-discussed shortcomings of the Lin and Yang references.

Accordingly, it is believed apparent that a person having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the Lin device in such a manner as to result in or otherwise render obvious the present invention of claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1, as well as claims 2-24 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

The Examiner's attention is also directed to the dependent claims which set forth additional features of the present invention and further define the invention over the prior art. For example, new claims 22-24 require the case to have a front surface that is generally tabular, and a rear surface opposite the front surface, wherein the display device 1 is disposed such that the screen exposed at the front surface of the case, wherein the rear surface is formed with a swollen portion 31 configured to fit in a palm, and wherein the hooking portion 7 is arranged such that, with the finger inserted into the hooking portion 7, the swollen portion 31 of the rear

surface of the case is fit in the palm. (See, for example, Fig. 4(d)). These features of the present invention are further clearly not disclosed or suggested by the prior art of record.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Shogo Hamasaki et al.

By:


Charles R. Watts
Registration No. 33,142
Attorney for Applicants

CRW/akl
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 3, 2006